## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

\_\_\_\_

JAY LIN, et al.

Plaintiffs, :

V.

Civ A. No. 3:18-CV-15387-BRM-LHG

HUDSON CITY SAVINGS BANK, et al.,

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Defendants. :

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for an Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction Should Not Be Issued. (ECF No. 22.) Ultimately, Plaintiffs seek an order "temporarily restraining Defendants Hudson City Savings Bank, M&T Bank and Parker McCay, PA, stay [sic] further prosecution of all foreclosure cases included Plaintiffs' case." (Proposed Order (ECF No. 22-12).) However, "[a] court of the United States may not grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State court except as expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments." 28 U.S.C. § 2283. Plaintiffs have not established why a stay would be appropriate in this matter, or why their request is properly before this Court.

Moreover, Plaintiffs have not established:

(1) a reasonable probability of eventual success in the litigation, and (2) that it will be irreparably injured . . . if relief is not granted. . . . [In addition,] the district court, in considering whether to grant a preliminary injunction, should take into account, when they are relevant, (3) the possibility of harm to other interested persons from the grant or denial of the injunction, and (4) the public interest.

Reilly v. City of Harrisburg, 858 F.3d 173, 176 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting Del. River Port Auth. v. Transamerican Trailer Transport, Inc., 501 F.2d 917, 919–20 (3d Cir. 1974)).

Accordingly, having reviewed Plaintiffs' motion and the exhibits submitted therewith, and

for good cause appearing,

IT IS on this 11th day of January 2019,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion (ECF No. 22) is **DENIED**. Remaining pending motions will be adjudicated in due course.

/s/ Brian R. Martinotti
HON. BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE